UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/528,229	03/18/2005	Daisuke Itoh	2005_0470A	6230
	7590 09/16/200 , LIND & PONACK, I	EXAMINER		
1030 15th Stree		WOOD, ELLEN S		
Suite 400 East Washington, DC 20005-1503			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
_			1794	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			09/16/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/528,229	ITOH ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
ELLEN S. WOOD	1794	

	ELLEN S. WOOD	1794	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>20 August 2009</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS AF	PPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR	ALLOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appetor Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit eal (with appeal fee) in compliance v	i, or other evidence, wwith 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date	of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth i ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	date of the final rejection	n.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.13 ension and the corresponding amount o hortened statutory period for reply origir	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Office	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with AMENDMENTS 	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be	but prior to the date of filing a brief	will not be entered be	031160
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further cor (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better	nsideration and/or search (see NOT w);	E below);	
appeal; and/or	to Tomi of appear by materially rea	idoling of onlipinging th	10 100000 101
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a converse NOTE: <u>see below</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33)		cted claims.	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	••	mpliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):			
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).		imely filed amendmer	nt canceling the
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:		be entered and an e	xplanation of
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	l and/or appellant fail:	s to provide a
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after en	itry is below or attach	ed.
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but see below.	t does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:
12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (13. ☐ Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
/Rena L. Dye/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1794			

The applicant argues that the properties of the stretched film of Shiiki would not have the similar properties to the applicant's stretched film.

In response, Shiiki discloses a the recurring unit of the glycolic acid polymer (pg. 7 lines 19-23). The aliphatic polyester comprises 98 wt% of glycolide and 2 wt% lactide [0066 and table 1]. Shiiki discloses that when the Tm of the polygylcolic acid is lowered, the processing temperature of the polymer can be lowered [0031]. Therefore, thermal decomposition upon melt processing can be reduced [0031]. The crystallization rate of the polyglycolic acid can also be controlled by copolymerization to improve its extrudability and stretchability [0031]. Shiiki discloses that in order to enhance physical properties, it is essential to keep a parison at a temperature not higher than its melting point, but not lower than its glass transition point, Tg upon stretch blow molding [0052]. The "stretch blow molding process" is a process in which stretching is conducted upon blow molding, thereby orienting the molecular chain of a polymer to enhance the physical properties of the polymer, such as strength [0052]. Thus, the missing limitations are necessarily present in the product of Shiiki, because the stretching intensity is present in the procedure to form the film. Also, the stretching process in Shiiki is disclosed to orientate the molecular chain to enhance physical properties which would include the melting point of the polyester. Thus, it is necessarily present that there would be an increase in the melting point of the polyester. Thus, the rejection presented in the 05/20/2009 final rejection is maintained.